DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 295 274 CS 506 228

AUTHOR Hertog, James K.; McLeod, Douglas M.
TITLE Anarchists Wreak Havoc in Downtown Minneapolis: A Case Study of Media Coverage of Radical Protest.
PUB DATE Jul 88
GRANT MH-39610
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (71st, Portland, OR, July 2-5, 1988).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Activism; Democracy; *Demonstrations (Civil); Dissent; Law Enforcement; Mass Media Effects; *Mass Media Role; *News Media; *Political Issues; *Press Opinion; Social Action
IDENTIFIERS *Anarchism; *Media Bias; Media Coverage; Minnesota (Minneapolis); Radical Movements; Social Movements

ABSTRACT

Media in democratic societies are generally assumed to have a responsibility to provide a forum for the articulation of diverse ideas, including radical discourse. Research on media coverage of groups which challenge the status quo, however, shows the limitations of the media in the democratic exchange of ideas. To evaluate the coverage of one of these "deviant" groups, an analysis focused on news coverage of two recent anarchist marches in downtown Minneapolis, Minnesota. Articles and television coverage from local newspapers and television stations were analyzed to determine the rhetoric used to describe the marches, the sources of information cited by the media, and the ideological frames of reference used to structure elements of the story. Results showed that the media (1) covered the anarchist marches in Minneapolis with a pro-establishment orientation; (2) tended to "marginalize" the group by focusing on the group's violence and appearance, as opposed to the issues being raised; and (3) framed the marchers as being in opposition to law enforcement instead of to government and big business. In addition, research on other newspapers shows that to gain exposure to a diversity of viewpoints on social protest, which includes thorough discussion of the issues being raised, it is necessary to go outside mainstream media accounts of social movements. (Sixteen notes are included.) (MS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED295274

ANARCHISTS WREAK HAVOC IN DOWNTOWN MINNEAPOLIS: A CASE STUDY OF MEDIA COVERAGE OF RADICAL PROTEST

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Douglas McLeod
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BY

JAMES K. HERTOG
DOUGLAS M. MCLEOD

School of Journalism and Mass Communication
University of Minnesota
111 Murphy Hall
Minneapolis, MN 55455

**** The authors are doctoral candidates in Journalism and Mass Communication at the University of Minnesota

**** Paper presented to the Qualitative Studies Division of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Portland, OR, July 4, 1988

**** This work was supported in part by U.S. Public Health Service National Institute of Mental Health grant #MH 39610

CS506228

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ANARCHISTS WREAK HAVOC IN DOWNTOWN MINNEAPOLIS: A CASE STUDY OF MEDIA COVERAGE OF RADICAL PROTEST

ABSTRACT

Media in democratic societies are generally assumed to have a responsibility to provide a forum for the articulation of diverse ideas, including radical discourse. The media often fall short of this lofty ideal. This case study evaluates the performance of local newspaper and television coverage of a "deviant" social movement. Media coverage of two Anarchist marches tended to "marginalize" the group by focusing on the group's violence and appearance, as opposed to the issues being raised. In addition, the marchers were framed as being in opposition to law enforcement instead of government and big business.

ANARCHISTS WREAK HAVOC IN DOWNTOWN MINNEAPOLIS: A CASE STUDY OF MEDIA COVERAGE OF RADICAL PROTEST

One important contribution of mass communication research has been to question the role of the media in a democratic society. There has been a great deal of inquiry into the processes of the production and dissemination of news. Recently, these efforts have focused on media coverage of groups which challenge the status quo[1]. This type of research yields insight into the limitations of the media in the democratic exchange of ideas.

The objectives of this paper are: 1) to review the literature on media coverage of groups perceived as "deviant" by "mainstream" society, and 2) to evaluate the coverage of one such "deviant" group, the Anarchist movement. The analysis focuses on news coverage of two Anarchist marches in downtown Minneapolis.

Ostensibly, one important notion underlying democratic theory is that a free and open "marketplace of ideas" is central to the "self-righting process." In this view, the media are said to act as a conduit for diverse ideas in order to provide a basis for democratic decision-making. In practice, the media often fall short of such lofty ideals. Structural limitations make selection, collation and interpretation necessary functions of the media. In the process, media messages are subject to the influence of social forces. It is clear from the mass communication literature that this has important implications for the coverage of social movements.

---

[1] Todd Gitlin, The Whole World is Watching: Mass Media in the Making and Unmaking of the New Left. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978); James D. Halloran, Phillip Elliott, and Graham Murdock, Demonstrations and Communication: A Case Study. (Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books, 1970); Stanley Cohen, Fold Devils and Moral Panics. (London: MacGibbon and Kee, 1973); and Charles Winnick, Deviance and the Mass Media. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1978).

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Several forces have been thought to affect coverage of dissent in the mainstream U.S. media. These forces stem from individual attitudes of journalists or owners, from organizational dynamics, from the ideology of the journalistic profession, from the political-economic system, and from the American culture itself.

Individual factors.

Early studies of bias in the media often looked at the attitudes, opinions and personalities of individual reporters and sometimes editors. The argument was straightforward--if journalists agreed with the dissenters, then they would write a favorable story. Journalists whose views were right or left of center would submit copy which would reflect their predilections. Of course, this copy would then be subjected to evaluation by the editor, who could also inject personal orientations into the story.[2]

Other individuals with power to slant the news are the publisher or managers. They can fire or discipline reporters with dissenting views and hire new journalists whose views are more congenial. However, studies have shown that journalists are relatively free of concern from such pressures.[3]

Another view is that journalists come disproportionately from middle class, liberal, mid-western, religious backgrounds. Writers and editors were assumed to espouse similar views producing content imbued with the values of

---

[2] David M. White, "The Gatekeeper: A Case Study in the Selection of News," Journalism Quarterly. 27:383-396 (Fall, 1950); see Robert A. Hackett, "Decline of a Paradigm?: Bias and Objectivity in News Media Studies," Critical Studies in Mass Communication. 1:229-259 (1984).

[3] Warren Breed, "Social Control in the Newsroom: A Functional Analysis," Social Forces. 33:326-355 (May, 1955); Lee Sigelman, "Reporting the News: An Organizational Analysis," American Journal of Sociology. 79:132-151 (July, 1973).

these demographic groups.[4] Spiro Agnew's attack on the press centered largely around his contention that the eastern press reflected a liberal, upper-middle class, intellectual bias. They did not, he claimed, reflect the views of the "silent majority."

Some studies argue that the press is liberal, while others hold it to be conservative. To some degree, conclusions depend on the group of journalists being studied. But perhaps more significant is the orientation of the person or group doing the study.

Organizational factors.

At another level of analysis, it can be said that news organizations, like any organization, seek to fulfill certain functions. Certainly organizational survival is high on the list. Perhaps the main organizational dynamic is the attempt to control the environment by reducing the randomness of inputs and outputs. News does not normally present itself, and it does not do so in the appropriate amount to fit the "news hole." It is necessary for the organization to produce news, and in order to do so, it develops a "beat system," placing reporters at strategic places where "news" occurs. These are usually sites of institutionalized power such as the police station, city hall, the statehouse, etc. Because news media are heavily reliant on official sources, news content tends to absorb the official outlook.[5] Reporters become

---

[4] David H. Weaver and G.Cleveland Wilhoit, The American Journalist: A Portrait of U.S. Newspeople and Their Work. (Bloomington, IN: University of Indiana Press, 1986).

[5] Mark Fishman, Manufacturing the News. (Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1980); Leon V. Sigal, Reporters and Officials. (Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath, 1973).

conditioned to seek official sources even for stories which occur outside the bureaucratic routines of the news organization.

It may be the case that organizations have a dynamic, a "personality" which is not traceable to the will of the owners or top management. It may have evolved from previous generations or may have developed out of the interaction of the organization with its environment. In any case, it appears that newspaper people are socialized to accept the "editorial policy" of their organization. Rewards flow to those who accept the policy, and subtle punishment to those who resist. The political and economic views favored in the news columns are generally the same within the organization, with some room for maneuver, especially for veteran and "star" reporters.[6]

Professionalism.

Journalism as a profession has certain codes and conventions which have an effect on newspaper content. Professions must have some claim to expertise and privilege, and journalism is no exception. Claims to promote the public good rest on democratic theory. Part of journalists' defense against attack lies in their claim to be "objective" or "fair." Tuchman has found that objectivity is a "strategic ritual." This ritual includes a set of practices and techniques which protect the journalist against criticism. These include: covering "both sides" of an issue, adducing evidence, and judicious use of quotation marks.[7]

Another professional need is a body of specialized knowledge. For journalists, this includes "news values." News values are applied to events to decide whether they are really "news." Among the important bases of

---

[6] Breed, "Social Control in the Newsroom: A Functional Analysis,"; Sigelman, "Reporting the News: An Organizational Analysis."

[7] Gaye Tuchman, "Objectivity as Strategic Ritual: An Examination of Newsmen's Notions of Objectivity," American Journal of Sociology. 77:660-679, (January, 1972); and Gaye Tuchman, Making News. (New York: Free Press, 1978).

newsworthiness are the economic and political impact on society and the dramatic nature of the story, including elements of sex and violence. Events are selected according to these criteria. Consequently, the media center stories around events as opposed to issues. As a result, dissenters may find it necessary to act in some unusual or violent manner to get media coverage (e.g., demonstrations, marches and terrorist acts).

Gans specifies several shared values of American journalists which include faith in altruistic nature of democracy and business. He, too, observes that journalists support the social order and the leadership which promotes it.[8]

System constraints.

At a higher level of analysis, the effect of system constraints on the overall coverage of dissent can be seen. In a capitalist system, certain groups of people are more powerful than others, and may be able to impress their views on the media coverage more readily than others. This has led to concern about ownership of the media by major corporations and about the interlocking directorates between media organizations and other corporations.[9] Capitalists or upper management, while differing over some issues, tend to support the existing social system. It has been argued that the content produced by their organizations reflects this value consensus.[10]

---

[8] Herbert J. Gans, Deciding What's News: A Study of the CBS Evening News, NBC Nightly News, Newsweek and Time, (New York: Vintage Books, 1979).

[9] Peter Dreier and S. Weinberg, "Interlocking Directorate," Columbia Journalism Review, 18(4):51-53 (November/December, 1979).

[10] Graham Murdock and Peter Golding, "Capitalism, Communication and Class Relations," in J. Curran, M. Gurevitch, and J. Woollacott, Mass Communication and Society. (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1977).

Another view is that market forces promote mainstream views by punishing those who stray too far from the middle. Radical viewpoints may jeopardize audience and advertising support, and new products will spring up which more clearly meet the demands of the market. Subscriptions and advertising move to mainstream publications, especially those that emphasize crowd-pleasing content, such as sex and violence.[11]

Hegemonic ideology.

Finally, it has been argued that the powerful maintain their positions in society through political hegemony. This viewpoint states that through the processes of coercion and consent, powerful forces in society are able to "impress their definitions of situations" on other groups within society. Gitlin explains:

> "Hegemonic ideology enters into everything people do and think is natural—making a living, loving, playing, believing, knowing, even rebelling. In every sphere of social activity, it meshes with the common sense through which people make the world seem intelligible; it tries to become that common sense. Yet, at the same time, people only partially and unevenly accept the hegemonic terms."[12]

Individuals and organizations within the dominant institutions in society generally share certain interests, including maintaining the status quo. In certain conscious and subconscious ways, these forces exert a disproportionately strong influence in shaping cultural values. It is this system of social values, shaped by dominant interests, which guide the production and dissemination of news.

Journalists, like most individuals, are socialized into the "mainstream" culture, and are likely to favor the dominant readings of events and issues.

---

[11] James Curran, "Capitalism and Control of the Press, 1800-1975," in James Curran, Michael Gurevitch, and Janet Woollacott, Mass Communication and Society. (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1977).

[12] Gitlin, The Whole World is Watching. p.10

Hall argues that news reporters have no choice but to pick from among the meanings the system makes available to them; the dominant meanings are the most prevalent.[13]

In addition, the hegemonic value system shapes the way news media are organized and their reporters are socialized. Gitlin notes that media "routines are structured in ways journalists are socialized from childhood, and then trained, recruited, assigned, edited, rewarded, and promoted on the job; they decisively shape the ways in which news is defined, events are considered newsworthy, and objectivity is secured."[14]

However, the powerful belief systems in the culture are constantly under attack by groups outside the dominant interests.[15] The question then arises, to what extent do the media provide a forum for this dissent?

Gitlin says that in the process of covering social movements, the media's "crucial unintended ideological effect is to undermine whatever efforts movements may make to present a general coherent political opposition; the effect is to reinforce the image that reform movements focus, and in the nature of things ought to focus, on single grievances which the system, however reluctantly, can correct without altering fundamental social relations. The media thus support the dominant system's claim to general legitimacy and its ability to fragment the opposition."[16]

---

[13] Stuart Hall, "Culture, Media and the Ideological Effect," in J. Curran, M. Gurevitch, and J. Woollacott, Mass Communication and Society, (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1977).

[14] Gitlin, The Whole World is Watching. p.11

[15] Stuart Hall, "Culture, Media and the Ideological Effect."

[16] Gitlin, The Whole World is Watching.

IMPLICATIONS FOR THE COVERAGE OF DISSENT

Together these forces impinge upon the process by which dissent is covered by the media. Certain patterns can be attributed to different combinations of these forces. For instance, the most overt expressions of opinion set in the news columns and the most obvious sorts of "name-calling" may come from the individual preferences of writers and editors. If individual factors are more important, then there should be a good deal of variation in the coverage of a deviant group within a given news organization.

If the "marginalization" of dissent can be attributed to the predilections of the owners or of top management, coverage should vary across organizations assuming there is some variance in predilections across organizations.

Emphasis on such factors as the violence and deviance of the protesters is likely to be an outcome of news values about what should be covered. News practices lead to the presentation of "both sides of the story." This artificially gives the impression that there are only two sides to a given story, or that the two views can be seen as directly opposed. The "judicious use of quotation marks" can be used to call into question opinions expressed by "deviant" groups.

The effects of system-level forces are harder to estimate. In general, this is because the nature of the system's influence is dependent upon the particular position of the news organization within that system. This requires looking at the concrete situation of each news organization separately.

In the realm of ideology, the faith in status quo which is a foundation of the dominant ideology would lead the journalist to interpret those who oppose that faith to be unbalanced or deviant. The reporter may even be unable to understand the views of the radical dissenter because he or she does not share the dissenters' core assumptions about the social system. This could lead to

false simplification or misrepresentation of the views of the dissenters. The reporter may dismiss the ideas of the group in the article or ignore the issues being raised altogether. If the ideological system is seen as a powerful determinant of news coverage of "deviant" groups, one would expect that there would be little variance in the coverage within mainstream media accounts.

The task of extricating the effects of each of these factors in the analysis of media content is difficult. They may be expected to interact in a unique configuration in each case. Based on the literature, we can draw several major generalizations: news coverage follows lines of institutional power, media will give less attention to groups which they perceive as being deviant, and finally, the coverage of such "deviant" groups will be distorted.

A CASE STUDY OF MEDIA COVERAGE OF ANARCHIST PROTESTS

This analysis is a comparison and contrast of various media accounts of two similar Anarchist marches in Minneapolis. The first march, the October 16, 1986 "War Chest Tour," was sponsored by the Progressive Student Organization and the Backroom Anarchist Center. Participants proceeded through a series of demonstrations in front of downtown businesses including WCCO television, Pillsbury and the Minneapolis Star and Tribune. Six protesters were arrested.

Several symbolic gestures were used to protest the contribution or complicity of these businesses to the "war effort." For instance, a television was smashed outside the television station, and the flags of the United States, the Soviet Union and McDonald's were burned outside the federal building.

The second march, on June 22, 1987, was the culmination of a five day annual convention of Anarchists. The gathering began with a reception at the Backroom Anarchist Center. The following three days included a series of workshops on topics pertinent to the Anarchist movement. Finally, the

anarchists conducted another "War Chest Tour" in downtown Minneapolis. The events of this protest included demonstrations outside downtown businesses and confrontations with police.

Primary concerns of this analysis are the rhetoric used to describe the marches, the sources of information cited by the media, and the ideological frames of reference used to structure elements of the story.

PRINT COVERAGE OF THE ANARCHIST MARCHES IN MINNEAPOLIS

The first march.

There was less print coverage of the first march than the second. The event was not covered in the St. Paul daily newspaper. The Minneapolis Star and Tribune ran a medium length story with a photograph in the center of page one. The story's headline reflects the mainstream view that the marches were disruptive to the social order: "Anarchists Organize to Wreak Havoc Downtown." Early in the story the movement was dismissed as being "young" and "disreputable." The tone of the article was condescending to the marchers:

> "The protesters drew a great deal of attention as they moved through the downtown with their pounding drums, waving flags and eccentric appearance, which included purple mohawk hairdos, black lipstick, flowing beards, pantaloons, jackets without sleeves and a turban or two."

The emphasis on the appearances of the marchers tends to obfuscate the message which they were trying to get across. In addition, the article neglects to mention that many marchers were dressed in "normal" attire. In any event, the appearance of the marchers is quite irrelevant to the issues they are raising. Nevertheless, appearances became a central element of the story.

The article stated that "one demonstrator spat on a police officer as an arrest was made," a juxtaposition which lends credibility to the arrest.

However, the reason for and justifiability of the arrest itself were never discussed.

Some attention was given to the rationale for the protest, quoting one marcher, "the government, multinational corporations, and the educational system interact together in a system to further their own ends of power and profit through control, exploitation and war." Without further elaboration, these thoughts may seem farfetched to the general public. Such positions need a much more thorough articulation in order to be given fair consideration.

The coverage of one stop on the protest march was strangely incomplete. A front page picture showed a protester burning an American flag. The photo, its caption, and the article itself failed to point out that a Soviet flag was simultaneously being burned. This omission focuses attention on the "anti-Americaness" of the protest, without recognizing the greater point being made about interventionist governments.

The actions of the demonstrators were largely examined on the basis of their criminality, not on the basis of their symbolic criticism of society. For instance, the article mentions that one-dollar bills were burned in front of a local bank. The meaning of this symbolic gesture was not discussed; the article only mentioned that, "police said that burning less than two dollars at once is not a crime." The events of the march are briefly recounted, but the reader is presented with no discussion of their intended meaning.

More attention was paid to the thoughts of bystanders than those of the anarchists. "What are they protesting?' one woman asked another, after being handed one of the groups fliers. 'It's hard to tell,' the other woman answered, 'But I think they are protesting everything."

There is considerable attention given to official points of view. Police, who "monitored" the situation, were accompanied by representatives from the

city attorney's office, "who were there to give on-the-spot advice on when the demonstrators might be breaking laws." Clearly, in this account, the established authority is taking precautions to act responsibly, unlike the protesters.

Quotes of authorities were reported without questioning the accuracy or appropriateness of the remarks. "Sergeant Robert Beckers of the Street Crimes Unit dismissed the demonstrators as "a bunch of punk-rockers...led by a small number, and I mean a small number, of people who are believers in wrecking and ruining things."

The meaning of anarchy was not addressed by mainstream media coverage. The term anarchy, though it was self-administered by the protesters, may give the general public a false impression of the goals of the movement. Stereotypes of anarchy may conjure up images of a society in chaos without compassion, ruled by force and the will of the strong. According to information passed out at the protest, this is clearly not the philosophy of the anarchist protesters. However, only one sentence in the Star and Tribune article dealt with anarchist philosophy in a way which might dispel potential false impressions. One protester was quoted as saying, "The group's philosophy is anti-war, anti-draft, ecology, feminism and punk." Other information presented in the article might have contributed to the misconception that the group promises a society ruled by violence and self-interest.

The Minnesota Daily, the student newspaper at the University of Minnesota, was slightly more sympathetic to the protesters. It mentioned that the reason one man was arrested was because he wrote on the wall of a stone building with a piece of chalk. It did, however, refrain from commenting on the appropriateness of the punishment for this "crime."

Again, the coverage in the Daily portrayed the police as the peace keepers, accommodating the marchers. One police officer said, "We don't care if they march. If they perform in a legal manner, they have the city."

Disparaging remarks were made toward the group's appearance. They were said to range from "scruffy" to "tattoo-skulled punks." The article was concluded with a laundry list of the group's activities over the course of the march. Again, there was little discussion of the meaning behind these symbolic gestures.

Despite the small amount of coverage devoted to this first march in the print media of the Twin Cities, articles about the march appeared in two New York-based publications, The Guardian, and Overthrow, a publication of the Youth International Party. By contrast to the local coverage, these article were very sympathetic to the demonstrators.

The Overthrow article emphasized the planning behind the march, which was not even mentioned elsewhere. This was the only publication that mentioned a booklet which was passed out by the marchers to explain the demonstration's purpose.

Overthrow also gave clear statements of the rationale behind each stop on the protest march. For instance, Pillsbury was picketed because of the "ownership of Burger King and other fast food enterprises which contribute to the destruction of the world's largest remaining rain forests in Central and South America."

As opposed to the other publications which emphasized the violence of the march, Overthrow said the event was "peaceful" and "cooperative." It portrayed the police as the instigators of rather than respondents to the violence. In addition, the publication provided criticism of the local media coverage of the

march, pointing out their excessive focus on the "punks" while ignoring the older demonstrators.

The estimation of the size of an event is one way in which ideology can manifest itself in the content of a news story. Overthrow estimated the number of protesters at 200. The Star and Tribune, however, did not take credit for their own estimate. Instead, they cited estimates from representatives of both sides of the conflict, the police (75) and the Back Room Anarchist Center (185). This newspaper, in its attempt to appear impartial, noted that "several people at the scene of the demonstration estimated that about 100 people participated." This conjures up an image of the hapless Star and Tribune reporter asking bystanders to estimate the crowd.

The second march.

The second protest was covered by both Twin Cities dailies, as well as the Minnesota Daily and the Detroit publication, Fifth Estate. From the sound of the headline in the St. Paul Pioneer Press-Dispatch, "Marchers create anarchy in Minneapolis," one would think that the story would be big news. However, the story and its two accompanying photographs were found in the third section of the paper. The "illegality" of the march was stressed throughout the article. The lead paragraph demonstrates the critical tone that the reporter took toward the "licentious parade":

> "It was anarchy in downtown Minneapolis on Monday--women bared their breasts, pin-striped businessmen were spat upon, art and buildings were defaced with spray paint, glass bottles were smashed, and people were pushed and shoved."

The article gives the impression that the protesters were the instigators of the violence, not recognizing that the marchers were not the only ones pushing and shoving. The article seems to place all culpability on the protesters. For instance, the sentence, "although some demonstrators resisted arrest and struck officers, no serious injuries were reported," seems to

indicate more concern with the safety of police officers then with that of the marchers.

Half of the paragraphs in the article were either direct or indirect quotes from the Deputy Police Chief who said that the protesters "came to challenge government authority and violate the law as they saw fit." He said that the officers showed "remarkable restraint" in the face of abuse.

After the view of the police officer was thoroughly presented, the article attempted to achieve balance by presenting the contrasting view of participant Kali Mari who stressed the non-violent philosophy of the demonstrators. However, the reader might discount the information in her statement as it was immediately preceded by the Deputy Police Chief's claim that the protesters "intimidated citizens, damaged downtown buildings, spray painted art objects on the Federal Reserve Building plaza, painted the Northern States Power Co. building and assaulted an NSP security guard."

The social control orientation of the article was exemplified by a quote from the Deputy Police Chief at the end of the article, "They can preach the philosophy of anarchy in Minneapolis, but if they break our laws they are going to jail."

The Minneapolis Star and Tribune was less direct in their assessment of who was the instigator in the violence. The caption of the front page picture said that a "scuffle" ensued after the police attempted to arrest one of the protesters. They noted that Mace was used on the marchers. But this article lacks the clear justification of police actions that was found in the St. Paul paper. The difference in orientation of the Star and Tribune article is exemplified by the headline of the second section article, "Police use Mace on anarchist marchers." This article mentioned the fact that the Mace also sprayed onlookers, reporters, photographers and even police officers.

This article focuses on the events of the "skirmish" which broke out between the police and the demonstrators. The description was more graphic, but yet not as one-sided as the St. Paul paper's article. The Star and Tribune article seemed to be based more on the reporter's eyewitness account and less on the statements issued by police officials. However, the underlying rationale for the march was not discussed at length. In addition, the article's conclusion was a statement from the Deputy Police Chief, "It should be noted that while they were marching through the city, other legitimate police calls could not be answered in the downtown area." No more specific information on this last point was provided.

Three articles appeared in the Minnesota Daily, the student newspaper. The first was an article on the Anarchist convention that was written the day of the protest march. This article focused on the diversity of ideas presented at the convention. The story emphasized both the commonalities and contrasts of the participants. It noted that there was disagreement over whether the revolution should be violent or non-violent and whether the new society would adopt modern technology. This article discussed these underlying issues. But again, appearances were mentioned--"young squatters with multi-colored hair, blue collar workers and college educated professionals."

A second article entitled, "Anarchorama," was short but seriously discussed the convention and the diverse ideas which motivated it. The protest marches were not directly addressed.

The final article was a collection of short essays on different aspects of the anarchist convention, the longest of which focused on the march. The tone was fairly critical of police actions, saying they were "spraying teargas indiscriminately....A woman who had been sprayed, eyes clenched shut, asked an officer for his badge number. J.J. Grates, No. 2936 responded by arresting her

and threatening others with the same." Again, a bystander was quoted, "Pretty seedy-looking group."

Outside the Twin Cities, the second march was covered by a collectively produced Detroit newspaper, Fifth Estate. The article in this newspaper focused primarily on the anarchist convention, providing background on the anarchist movement and the conference attenders. This article contained the most thorough discussion of the various philosophies and ideas of the participants. Included in their coverage were three articles written by participants in the 1987 Anarchist gathering. The coverage in Fifth Estate is a stark contrast to the coverage by mainstream publications which focused predominately on the events and violence of the protest march.

Criticism of the event did come through in the Fifth Estate articles, but it was very different from the "violence" and "appearance" criticisms that appeared in the mainstream print media. Instead, the criticism took place on a more philosophical plane. For instance, one contributor felt that, "It seemed to many who had attended a few dull workshops that a large number of the participants had little, if any, knowledge of previous anarchist movements. While some of us thought understanding at a gut level is just as valuable as 'having analysis,' others argued the necessity for reading history and a variety of perspectives."

The coverage in Fifth Estate was not without descriptive elements. But the description was very different, taking the perspective of the participant observer. For instance:

> "From there we headed down through the shopping district where some folks stopped off at a vendor selling cold ones. To me, this was actually the funniest stop! There was a line of anarchists, with their signs and masks, waiting to buy cokes and so on. Makes me wonder if we could throw a revolution without soda pop, or do things go better with coke--even anarchy?"

In essence, one can get a diversity of viewpoints on the events and issues surrounding social protest. But it is difficult to find that diversity in one source alone. In order to get this diversity in the print coverage of the Minneapolis anarchy marches, one certainly had to go beyond the mainstream media.

TELEVISION COVERAGE OF THE ANARCHIST MARCHES IN MINNEAPOLIS

While coverage among the four local television stations with news programs varied, the poles of the coverage can be defined by WCCO, the most empathetic to the anarchists, and KSTP, the most consistently opposed.

To begin their filmed coverage of the June 22 march, KSTP's reporter, Lou Harvin said, "These protesters call themselves anarchists." The picture on the screen was of marchers, some waving flags. Harvin followed with, "They claim they're opposed to any and all forms of government, and the demonstration began quietly. Then some of them became vandals, defacing some downtown buildings. Windows here at the Northern States Power building were spray painted. A few also hurled rocks and other debris at Minneapolis police who were standing by." The camera shots were of a couple of windows with red paint on them, and then a pan shot from behind the police looking out on the mall where the marchers are. A can comes flying out of the crowd toward the police, one of whom tries to catch it, then cannot and dodges it.

This frame of reference set the tone for the rest of the coverage. Through the rhetoric of news, the veracity of the protesters in calling themselves anarchists was questioned, as was their "claim" that they are against all forms of government. No other mention of anarchist doctrine was made in the account. The protest was defined as crime, with the police not as aggressors, but as reactants (they were 'standing by'). The account then gave

details of the number of arrests and the particular laws allegedly broken. Deputy Police Chief Lutz was interviewed. He talked about a case where one protester was arrested and in a squad car. He stated, "Several people tried to open the squad door, and let the prisoner go, and that is something that we will simply not tolerate." The demonstration was "brought under control" after 10 police on street patrol "called for a backup" and 24 more officers arrived.

Harvin also talked to a street vendor about the march. He stated, "Some vendors, meanwhile, who saw the protesters say they were not impressed with their message or their tactics." The next shot was of a middle-aged woman saying, "I just don't appreciate it as a citizen of such a wonderful free country."

To finish up the account, Harvin quoted Lutz as saying that he didn't care about the anarchists' color of hair, type of clothes or message they delivered. If they broke the laws of the city of Minneapolis, they would face the consequences.

WCCO presents a very different picture of the demonstration. Darrel Savage began his report thus, "They said it was the perfect time to do it. Many in the group of 300 anarchists were in town for a weekend convention and decided to march through the streets. The protesters are against government power and wanted their voices to be heard. Suddenly, those voices changed." Up to this time, scenes were of marchers chanting and walking along the downtown mall. The scene turns to a police-protester scuffle.

Savage continued, "Police say they got involved when the anarchists started spray-painting buildings." Deputy-Chief Lutz is then quoted, "This is clearly whether or not citizens of this city can break the law with impunity, and the answer is no."

Unlike KSTP, WCCO allowed a response by the anarchists. Savage stated, "The marchers say police were instigators by showing their billy clubs." An anarchist then said, "Halfway through the police started to disrupt the whole thing. It was kind of disappointing to see that they did stop it and they were able to use force to break it up."

The coverage went on to discuss the confrontations between police and anarchists, but in ways that saw the police as active in the confrontations, not simply as passive. "Angry marchers threw rocks as police charged them with mace." Much of the visual material showed one or more police officers wrestling protesters to the ground. In one case, a protester had his face forced rather brutally against the pavement. However, a review of the out-takes showed that the most violent parts of this scene were edited out.

Savage stated that many were hit with the mace, even bystanders. He questioned the use of mace by saying that the police defended its use. Lutz was then shown on camera, defending use of the mace.

To end the piece, Savage said he had talked to protesters and they said that due to the violence, the next anarchist march would come to Minneapolis sooner than expected.

In addition, WCCO broadcast a profile of two anarchists and the Backroom bookstore, a sponsor of the weekend conference. One of the anarchists was Rat, a 16-year-old with the sides of his head shaved and long orange-died hair hanging out the back of his red beret. The camera followed him as he left the protest and got on a bus. A short biography of his troubles in school, and his gradual adoption of anarchist philosophy were shown. He said, "Anarchists feel that people can run their lives without having someone run it for them. And there's aspects of racism and sexism--it's any oppression against other people. I feel it's very wrong."

The other short profile is of Carla, who became an anarchist in Kansas before moving to Minneapolis. She stated that seeing someone get arrested or "for no reason getting beat upon" may lead to becoming an anarchist.

The profile of the bookstore started with people milling around outside, then a woman was shown entering while hiding her face with a book.

Reporter Trish van Pilsum noted, "The message is spread through books, periodicals, and music. And occasionally through highly visible protest (cut to a scene of police and protesters scuffling). As the scuffling and yelling continues on the screen, van Pilsum said, "Despite the appearance of today's protest, the anarchists say they are not about chaos, do not envision a world without any order. They argue that in a world without rules and laws, people would learn to care for each other." She then signed off.

In KSTP's account, the blame for violence is clearly attributed to the protesters. Police are not active instigators, and only enter in when forced. No mention was made of the police's use of mace. None of the anarchists were given air time to speak, and the movement's philosophy was reduced to "They claim they're opposed to any and all forms of government." Emphasis was on conflict with the police and reactions of bystanders. The words "call themselves" and "claim" are used in a manner which delegitimizes the protesters as a political group.

Video showed much of the vandalism, including painted windows and a smashed window in a police car. Many shots were from behind the police, so that the viewer was put in the position of the police, thus adopting that viewpoint visually. None of the shots showed excessive force, the way some of those in the WCCO piece did.

The story WCCO gave is much less certain of culpability and questions the severity of police actions, particularly the use of mace. An effort to present

the anarchist philosophy was made. The audience view switched from police to protesters and back again, as the camera was placed alternately behind the protesters and the police. The bystander's view was not shown. However, in attempting to adopt an "objective" view, the reporter assumed the role of the bystander.

Despite their differences, the two accounts have some important similarities. For one, the story is framed to pit the protesters against the police in both instances. However, the anarchists were protesting government actions and power, as well as corporate power. By interviewing Lutz rather than the president of the largest local bank or the mayor or a Minnesota senator, etc., the coverage defines the protesters as law breakers rather than political protesters. Defining the opposition also defines who the protagonists are.

Also, both of the accounts emphasized violence, whether culpability was clear or not. Obviously, much of what went on was peaceful, but less coverage was given to non-violent aspects of the marches. The coverage adopted the official legal framework of the system, and often talked about the breaking of laws, but rarely of the moral or philosophical issues the anarchists wished to raise.

The legal rhetoric of the system was used to describe several symbolic acts. For instance, graffiti aimed at communicating dissent was termed "defacing some downtown buildings." Lutz defined the incident in terms of "obeying the laws of the city of Minneapolis" and the two news stories generally followed that frame of reference.

CONCLUSION

In general, mainstream media covered the Anarchist marches in Minneapolis with a pro-establishment orientation. There was a distinct emphasis on the "violence" and appearances of the protesters as opposed to the issues that they were raising. Often the rationale behind symbolic actions of the protesters were ignored by the media. In cases where the meanings were ignored, the reader or viewer can not be expected to understand the points that the protesters were attempting to make.

The most dramatic way in which the message behind the protest was defused by mainstream media was the legalistic context in which the story was framed. The police were set up as the opposition to the protesters, not government and big business who were the demonstrators' intended opposition. The bottom line is that in mainstream accounts of this event, the story was not a question of social protest, but one of legality.

Reporters did not talk to those being protested. This would have forced them to address the issues being raised more thoroughly. In addition, it might have legitimized the criticisms by accepting that they were worthy of discussion. Thus criticism was deflected away from the institutions of business and government as the protests were put in the realm of law enforcement.

Most of the mainstream media accounts of the marches took the point of view of the police. For instance, in the television coverage of the protest, the camera captured the action from behind the police lines giving the viewer the visual perspective of the police officers. On the whole, this is symbolic of the mainstream media coverage, which accepted police accounts of the protest rather unquestioningly. Similarly, the responses of the police, which included

the use of force and mace, were left virtually unchallenged. The police were portrayed as mere respondents to the violence of the anarchists.

For the print coverage, mainstream publications such as the Twin Cities' daily newspapers were less accepting of the anarchists than either the student newspaper or alternative publications. To some degree this may be a function of market forces. The daily newspapers are aimed at a more general audience. They are under more pressure to produce content that is consistent with the existing dominant ideology. Publications with more specialized audiences will have a tendency to produce content that is consistent with the outlook of their audience. Hence, publications with a predominantly left-wing readership, such as Overthrow, or Fifth Estate were more sympathetic to the anarchist cause.

However, this does not preclude the possibility of some degree of variation within the dominant perspective. For instance, there was quite a bit of variation in the way local television stations covered the anarchist marches. At the extremes were the coverage by local television stations KSTP and WCCO. The latter seemed to take its "social responsibility" to provide a forum for the articulation of diverse viewpoints more seriously. WCCO indeed provided information from the perspective of the anarchists, whereas KSTP did not. This raises a question for further research: Did the difference that was found between the coverage by KSTP and WCCO represent an organizational difference, or was it attributable to differences between the individual reporters who covered the story? Answering this question will require the examination of their coverage of many more radical protests to see if the difference in orientation persists.

In the case of the print coverage, there was some variation within the accounts of one organization, The Minneapolis Star and Tribune. The coverage of the second anarchist march was not nearly as critical as the coverage of the

first march. This may be an indication that the orientation of the individual reporter makes a difference in terms of how radical protest is portrayed.

Organizational and professional factors seemed to play an important role in shaping the news coverage. The mainstream print media made heavy use of police officials as sources of information. This heavy reliance, coupled with the lack of skepticism of official police commentary, prompted stories to take on the orientation of institutional authority.

Another reason for the one-sided status quo orientation of the coverage may be the lack of experience or background knowledge of reporters and their news organizations about non-mainstream groups. A lack of familiarity with the ideas which underpin the anarchist movement may have led reporters to reject the ideas out of hand. Perhaps the lack of familiarity caused the journalists to rely more heavily on standard practices and interpretations.

The patterns found in the mainstream media coverage of radical social protest have potentially major consequences. First, if dissent is marginalized and decontextualized by the media, a valuable source of social criticism will be washed out. This type of constriction of the "free marketplace of ideas" is contrary to the ideals of a democratic system. The image of the media as an adversary to government is also drawn into question. If the media fail to convey significant criticism of the social power structure, they may be participating in the maintenance of existing power relations, and thereby be suppressing social change.

If one wants to be exposed to a diversity of viewpoints on social protest, which includes thorough discussion of the issues being raised, then one needs to go outside mainstream media accounts of social movements. This presents three problems for society. First of all, most of the general public may not be aware of the limited view of social issues presented in mainstream media.

Secondly, alternative media have little visibility in society. Both awareness of and access to alternative media is limited. Finally, the modest financial resources of alternative media hampers their ability to cover and disseminate information on important events and issues.